



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/882,197

06/15/2001

Pierre Quentin

229.009

8015

23598

7590

04/21/2004

BOYLE FREDRICKSON NEWHOLM STEIN & GRATZ, S.C.
250 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 1030
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

PEREZ, ANGELICA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/882,197

Applicant(s)

QUENTIN ET AL.

Examiner

Angelica M. Perez

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen (Heinonen et al.; US Patent No.: 5,887,266) in view of Beaudou (Beaudou, M. Patrice; US Patent No.: 6,671,522 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Heinonen teaches of a method for management of a communications module comprising means to fulfill a communications function (column 1 and 2, lines 48-49 and 25-29) , and a detachable microcircuit for a terminal comprising means (figure 3c item 13; column 4, lines 55-56), including a microprocessor (figure 3b, item 19), to set up a man/machine interface in which the microcircuit and the terminal communicate by sending messages through a module-terminal connection between the module and the terminal (column 5, lines 16-20 and 39-44; where the modem provides the interface),

Heinonen does not teach where messages are sent from the microcircuit to the terminal, in the module, messages sent by the microcircuit are distributed between the module and the terminal to limit the communications on the module-terminal connection and to limit an activity, related to a processing of a message, of the microprocessor of the terminal.

In related art, concerning a process comprising an identification module for running an application, Beaudou teaches where messages are sent from the microcircuit to the terminal, in the module, (column 3, lines 40-44; "commands" correspond to messages) messages sent by the microcircuit are distributed between the module and the terminal to limit the communications on the module-terminal connection and to limit an activity (column 3, line 25-27; where the terminal runs only "part" of the application; therefore, limiting the activity of the module-terminal connection), related to a processing of a message, of the microprocessor of the terminal (column 3, lines 31-39; where the card's microprocessor, by sending the commands, limits the processing activity of the terminal).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Heinonen's a method for management of a communications module with Beaudou's messages distribution arrangement in order to lighten the processing load of the terminal).

Regarding claim 2, Heinonen in view of Beaudou teaches all the limitations according to claim 1. Beaudou's, further teaches where a message of the microcircuit is processed in the terminal (column 6, line s60-65), the results of the processing are notified to the microcircuit (column 9, lines 58-67; where it is inherent in the art to "acknowledge" or "notify" the results of the operation as part of the protocol).

Regarding claim 5, Heinonen and Beaudou teach all the limitations of claims 1. Heinonen further teaches where the messages exchanged between the microcircuit and the terminal are formatted according to a Hayes type format by formatting means of the

Art Unit: 2684

module (column 9, lines 24-49; where the ATention commands follow the Hayes protocol).

Regarding claim 6, Heinonen and Beaudou teach all the limitations of claims 1. Beaudou further teaches where a message sent by the microcircuit or the terminal respectively to the terminal or the microcircuit respectively is included in the following list: +CTKC list of parameters AT+CTKR list of parameters +CTKE list of parameters AT+CTKV list of parameters +CTKER list of the parameters AT+CTKP list of parameters AT+CTKF list of parameters (column 4, lines 28-42; where the Attention commands vary according to desired application).

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen in view of Beaudou as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ritter (Ritter et al.; US Patent No.: 6,085,099).

Regarding claim 3, Heinonen in view of Beaudou teaches all the limitations according to claim 1.

Heinonen and Beaudou do not teach where the messages sent by the microcircuit are filtered for the transmission, to the terminal, of those messages related to a management of the man/machine interface, the other messages being processed by the means of the module.

In related art, concerning a message transmission system, Ritter teaches where the messages sent by the microcircuit are filtered for the transmission (column 3, lines 16-21), to the terminal (column 3, line 20), of those messages related to a management of the man/machine interface, the other messages being processed by the means of the

module (column s 3 and 4, lines 66-67 and 1-16, respectively; where the filter pipes information according to its destination).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Heinonen's a method for management of a communications module with Ritter's filter in order to obtain a more desirable distribution of messages according to its destination in order to avoid delays and undesirable clustering of information in one location.

Regarding claim 4, Heinonen and Beaudou teach all the limitations of claims 1. Ritter further teaches where the messages sent out by the microcircuit are filtered to transmit those messages that correspond to a response of the microcircuit following a request sent by the terminal, the other messages being processed by means of the module (column s 3 and 4, lines 66-67 and 1-16, respectively. Where the messages are filtered according to the destination criteria).

4. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen in view of Ritter (Ritter et al.; US Patent No.: 6,085,099).

Regarding claim 7, Heinonen teaches of a communications device comprising a terminal (column 1, lines 5-8; e.g., "mobile station"), comprising means to make a man/machine interface and an extension module for the terminal (column 2, lines 16-42; where the "application module" corresponds to the "extension module"), the extension module comprising a microcircuit (figure 3a, item SIM), where: the terminal and the module comprise communications means to communicate with each other (column 1, lines 25-31 and 48-49).

Heinonen does not teach where the module comprises means to filter messages sent by the microcircuit, the filtering means co-operating with the communications means.

In related art, concerning a process comprising an identification module for running an application, Ritter teaches where the module comprises means to filter messages sent by the microcircuit (column 3, lines 16-21), the filtering means co-operating with the communications means (column s 3 and 4, lines 66-67 and 1-16, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Heinonen's a method for management of a communications module with Ritter's filter in order to obtain a more desirable distribution of messages according to its destination in order to avoid delays and undesirable clustering of information in one location.


Regarding claim 8, Heinonen in view of Ritter teaches all the limitations of claim 7. Heinonen further teaches of a device, where the terminal comprises means for the management of the microcircuit cooperating with the communications means (column 2, lines 42-49).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 703-305-8724. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:15 a.m. - 3:55 p.m., Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.


Angelica Perez
(Examiner)


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Nay A. Maung
(SPE)

Art Unit 2684

April 9, 2004